

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1699

MICHAEL J. SINDRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN ZACKER,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 05-1910

MICHAEL J. SINDRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN ZACKER,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 05-2016

MICHAEL J. SINDRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN ZACKER; DAVID H. HYDE; SUSAN SIGAFOOS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (CA-05-1660-8-PJM; CA-05-1978-PJM)

Submitted: November 17, 2005

Decided: November 22, 2005

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

Nos. 05-1699 and 05-1910, affirmed; No. 05-2016, dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael J. Sindram, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Michael J. Sindram appeals district court orders denying his motion to proceed in forma pauperis, denying his motion for clarification and modification and dismissing without prejudice his complaint for failing to state a claim. We have reviewed the records and the district court orders. With respect to Appeal Nos. 05-1699 and 05-1910, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Sindram v. Zacker, No. CA-05-1660-8-PJM (D. Md. June 20, 2005 & July 6, 2005). With respect to Appeal No. 05-2016, the court dismissed without prejudice Sindram's complaint and instructed Sindram as to the deficiencies in the complaint and how they may be cured. Because Sindram may refile his complaint, the dismissal order is interlocutory and not appealable. See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we affirm Nos. 05-1699 and 05-1910 and dismiss No. 05-2016. We grant Sindram's motions to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

Nos. 05-1699/05-1910 - AFFIRMED
No. 05-2016 - DISMISSED